Dear Linda Jackson.

I would like the Forest Service to reject the proposed mine and choose the No Action Alternative.

I am concerned that the mine will impact our Wild and Scenic rivers. Water, light, and dust pollution will effect the Middle Fork of the Salmon River while the Main Salmon River will receive all pollutants carried downstream by the East Fork South Fork of the Salmon River and the South Fork of the Salmon River. Additionally, there are 3 rivers deemed eligible or suitable for protection under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act that fall within the analysis area: the South Fork of the Salmon River, Burntlog Creek, and Johnson Creek. The SDEIS states (3.23.4.2) that “detailed baseline data for existing water quality where the SGP components intersect the SFSR at Warm Lake Road have not been compiled.” The SDEIS determines that the water quality in the South Fork of the Salmon River would “likely be too small to measure” (p. 4-638) and says the same about Burntlog Creek (p.3-488). Baseline conditions need to be studied to provide an accurate assessment of water quality. “Too small to measure” is not an acceptable assessment. Is the Forest Service prepared to violate the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act? Is the Forest Service willing to sacrifice Wild and Scenic Rivers Act designation, and therefore protection, of the South Fork, Burntlog Creek, and Johnson Creek for mining activity? If the Forest Service values the mineral gold more than water, please explain.

I am concerned that the Burntlog route goes through 15 miles of Inventoried Roadless Areas and that the avalanche risk has not been appropriately accounted for. Burntlog would be the second highest road in Idaho with 30 miles above 7000 feet —10 of those miles above 8000 feet. Galena Summit is the highest road in Idaho, and it receives less than half the average annual snow-water equivalent at 20.8” —Burntlog is 42.1”. The SDEIS consistently underestimates the avalanche danger in the area and does not consider the increase in road maintenance and travel time during inclement weather. Add to that, should vehicles be directly impacted by avalanche, it will take area agencies hours to reach the location and at great risk to their responders. Is the Forest Service prepared to provide responders when avalanches occur? What is the Forest Service going to do when Burntlog becomes impassable and mine activity needs to continue? Who will be responsible should a spill on Burntlog occur? What is the plan for when spills reach the Frank Church Wilderness?

I am concerned that Perpetua Resources is using antimony – a critical mineral – as a selling point. The Stibnite Gold Project is forecasting 115 million pounds of antimony to be mined. Every gold mine produces antimony. The Stibnite Gold Project is manipulating the public and government administrations by dangling antimony as a benefit. Ninety-five percent of the Stibnite Gold Project profits will come from gold sales. Gold is not a critical mineral. Additionally, where will the antimony be processed? The idea that the United States needs a domestic source of antimony is immediately negated when said mineral is processed outside of the United States. Can Perpetua Resources and the Forest Service guarantee all antimony mined from Stibnite will be processed domestically? Can the Forest Service honestly say that the Stibnite Gold Project is the only way the United States can get 115 million pounds of antimony over a 20-year span? Can the Forest Service stand behind the principle being sold that this is an antimony mine, not a gold mine? What steps will the Forest Service take to ensure that the antimony mined from Stibnite actually ends up in the United States for use?

I am concerned about so much more – water quality, climate change, fisheries (the SDEIS claims *irreversible losses* to steelhead, salmon, bull trout, and cutthroat trout (SDEIS p. 4-386)), wildlife, habitat, soil degradation, socioeconomics, recreation, tribal rights, light pollution, hazmat spills, air quality, wetlands, tailings storage, the fish tunnel, perpetual care, and so much more. The 1667 pages of the SDEIS and the 2 years since the DEIS was issued was still not enough to address the risk this project has to Valley County and the communities downstream and downwind. Because of this, I would like the Forest Service to reject the proposed mine and choose the No Action Alternative.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Nate Ostis